

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

	•			v
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/694,197	10/27/2003	Chan-Soo Hwang	678-1213 (P10804)	3868
66547 7590 06/13/2007 THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, P.C.		EXAMINER		
333 EARLE OVINGTON BOULEVARD			TRAN, KHAI	
SUITE 701 UNIONDALE, NY 11553			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
·			2611	
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/13/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/694,197	HWANG ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		KHAI TRAN	2611			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any I	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE in a sign of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time 11 apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONED	I. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 Ms. This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Dispositi	on of Claims					
 4) Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-3,10-12,19-21 and 29-31 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 4-9,13-18,22-28,32-37 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 						
Applicati	on Papers					
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the o Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is objected to be a second or the drawing(s) is objected to be a second or the drawing(s) is objected to be a second or be a secon	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment						
2) D Notice 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te			

Art Unit: 2611

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed 5/10/2007 has been entered. Claims 1-37 are pending in this Office action.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 5/10/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant states in the Remarks that the present application was filed before either the '579 application other '493 application, the nonstatutory obviousness-double patenting rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

In response to Applicant's argument that the terminal disclaimer should be filed in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321 (c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct

Application/Control Number: 10/694,197

Art Unit: 2611

from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1, 2, 3, 10, 11, 12, are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 3 of copending Application No. 10/695,579. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1, 2, 3, 10, 11, 12 of the instant application merely broadens the scope of the claims 1, 2, 3 of the copending Application No. 10/695,579 by eliminating the elements and their functions of claims 1, 2, 3, 10, 11, 12 of the instant Application. The preamble of the instant Application recites a data transmission apparatus and a method having maximum diversity gain in a mobile communication system while the co-pending application recites transmitting a sequence for channel estimation in a mobile communication system. Therefore, it would to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time invention as made to realize that both inventions used to perform transmitting signal in mobile communication system. It has been held that the omission an element and its function is an obvious expedient if the remaining elements perform the same function as before.

Application/Control Number: 10/694,197

Art Unit: 2611

In re Karlson, 136 USPQ 184 (CCPA). Also note Ex parte Rainu, 168 USPQ 375 (Bd.App.1969); omission of a reference element whose function is not needed would be obvious to one skilled in the art.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

5. Claims 19, 20, 21, 29, 30, 31, are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 15. 16, 17 of copending Application No. 10/695,493. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 19, 20, 21, 29, 30, 31 of the instant application merely broadens the scope of the claims 15, 16, 17 of the co-pending Application No. 10/695,493 by eliminating the elements and their functions of claims 19, 20, 21, 29, 30, 31 of the instant Application. The preamble of the instant Application recites a data reception apparatus and a method having maximum diversity gain in a mobile communication system while the co-pending application recites receiving data in a mobile communication system which receives through N reception antennas modulated symbol stream through M transmission antennas from a transmitter. Therefore, it would to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time invention as made to realize that both inventions used to perform transmitting signal in mobile communication system. It has been held that the omission an element and its function is an obvious expedient if the remaining elements perform the same function as before. In re Karlson, 136 USPQ 184 (CCPA). Also note Ex parte Rainu, 168 USPQ 375 (Bd.App.1969); omission of a reference element whose function is not needed

Art Unit: 2611

would be obvious to one skilled in the art.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 4-9, 13-18, 22-28, 32-37 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KHAI TRAN whose telephone number is (571) 272-3019. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00AM - 4:30PM.

Application/Control Number: 10/694,197 Page 6

Art Unit: 2611

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JAY PATEL can be reached on (571) 272-2988. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KHAI TRAN
Primary Examiner

Monaranter

Art Unit 2611

KT June 8, 2007